

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: November 10 and 17, 2005

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: JO Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Marc Laurin, Mark Hemmerlein, Cathy Goodmen, Kevin Nyhan, Charles Hood, Alex Vogt, Tobey Reynolds, Ram Maddali, , NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, and Edna Feighner, NHDHR; Bill O'Donnell and Ed Woolford, FHWA; Liz Hengen, Preservation Consultant; and Jamie Paine, CLD; Karen Mack-Piacentini, TRC; Kurt Beek, Anthony Lyons, and Guy Santagate, City of Claremont; Rich Rooney, McFarland-Johnson; Wayne Husband, City of Nashua; Jon McDonald, Rizzo; Matthew Walsh, City of Concord.

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

NOTES ON CONFERENCE

Thursday, November 10, 2005

Laconia, X-A000(096), 13895. Participants: Tobey Reynolds, Mark Hemmerlein, and Ram Maddali; Karen Mack Piacentini (TRC); and Kevin Dunleavy and Paul Moynihan from the Town of Laconia; Linda Wilson, DHR.

K. Piacentini noted that the presence of a large site in the beach area. Deposits associated with it have been found from Lakeside Avenue across to Warren Street. Particularly in the beach area there are intact, deep deposits after the first 40-50 cm of disturbance. The deposits are characterized as black greasy soils. It is assumed that the deposit goes under the parking lot. Testing found deposits beyond Veterans Avenue to the chain link fence. In this area, K. Piascentini found a mixed plow zone down 50 cm, and then intact deposits. Beyond this area along the remainder of the project area, testing did not locate any archaeological deposits.

K. Piacentini explained that the beach area had been tested in the 1970s. This testing found intact deposits in the beach area after 40-50 cm. They varied in age from 3000 to 9600 BP. Disturbance increases as one goes away from the beach. There are intact deposits at the flagpole. Thus, the whole area was once heavily occupied.

T. Reynolds explained that the drainage was undersized, allowing flooding to occur. As a result, the NHDOT would separate the runoff from the state highway from the remainder of the drainage system. The design will need to turn the drainage before it reaches the railroad abutments, and it would drop under the railroad grade and the sewer line. If a trench box were used, the excavation would be reduced to 6-8' wide and about 10' deep. While the NHDOT will continue to look at this route, a new route that outlets near the beach house was discussed. The City of Laconia agreed to provide the information it possesses concerning existing drainage and other lines in the

beach area to enable the examination of previously disturbed areas. If the NHDOT decided to continue with some version of its current route, then archaeological investigations would precede construction, given the known sensitivity of the area. If the design were routed under roadways that prevent access, then these areas would need to be monitored with plans halt construction as archaeological material required recovery.

Thursday, November 17, 2005

Albany, X-A000(190), 13632B. Participant: Kevin Nyhan

Kevin Nyhan discussed this project, which involves safety improvements and widening along a 1.2-mile section of NH Route 112 (Kancamagus Highway) in Albany. The limits of work are from the east end of the previous Albany, 13632A project, east to the Lower Falls rock cut project. There are no extant structures along this section of roadway. The general intent of the project is to keep the existing centerline where it is and widen an even 3' on each side to achieve an 11-5 typical section. Edna stated that, based on the limited scope and the steep embankment to the south side of the roadway and the Swift River immediately to the north, she had no concerns for archaeology, except those areas where the terrain on the south side of the roadway is not as steep. If impacts are incurred in these areas, a future review will be required. A No Historic Properties Affected memo will be signed at the next meeting.

Keene-Milford, X-A000(061), 13856.. Participant: Kevin Nyhan

The proposed project consists of guardrail upgrades along a portion of NH Route 101 in the towns of Keene, Marlborough, Dublin, Peterborough, Temple, Wilton, and Milford. The limits of work are from approximately the NH Route 101/ Main Street intersection in Keene, east 33 miles to the NH Route 101/ NH Route 101A intersection in Milford. The project will address deficient runs of guardrail through replacement or elimination with improvements to terminal units. Currently, all work will remain within the limits of existing right-of-way. Discussion focused on the use of the MOU executed by SHPO, DOT, and FHWA, which exempts these types of project from formal review with NHDHR as long as the cultural resources manager at NHDOT is 36-CFR-61-qualified and reviews these projects to identify possible exceptions. Unless this and future projects will substantially alter the visual characteristics of a significant historic resource in this 33-mile stretch, i.e. significant historic buildings are close to the road, they need not be reviewed formally. A note to the file will be prepared outlining how this project qualifies under the MOU as "No Historic Properties Affected."

Statewide, IM-X-000S(397), 13408. Participant: Kevin Nyhan

The proposed project will involve a feasibility study at the Taylor River Dam in Hampton and North Hampton. Since the bridge under I-95 is at least 50 years, it was reviewed for its eligibility. It was agreed that based on the type of bridge, steel sheet piling and concrete, it is not eligible for the National Register. Associated work with the feasibility study will not need to include any significant architectural surveys or archaeological work. If a new dam is proposed outside the right-of-way, some level of archaeology may be required. A "No Historic Properties Affected" memo can be signed at a future meeting.

Claremont, X-A000(089), 13888. Participants: Ram Maddali; Kurt Beek (kbeek@claremontnh.com), Anthony Lyons, and Guy Santagate, City of Claremont; Rich Rooney, McFarland Johnson; and Liz Hengen, Preservation Consultant

- A. Project Presentation – McFarland Johnson (MJ) presented the following:
 - 1. Description of project (Project need, Funding, Current Status and Schedule)
 - 2. Historic Context by Liz Hengen
 - 3. Bridge Type Study
 - a. Architect Involvement
 - b. Arch theme desirable
 - c. Steel Arch
 - d. Glu-Lam Arch
 - e. Prefabricated Bridge (with and without arch and roof)
 - f. Cost Issues
 - g. Evaluation of Central Street Bridge (Bristol-New Hampton)
 - h. City's decision not yet final.
 - 4. Bridge alignment and span configuration
 - 5. Access Road Options and Parking Area
- B. Description of Project
 - 1. The project includes the construction of a new pedestrian bridge over the Sugar River including pathway approaches. The project may include a limited amount of parking spaces on the north side of the river with a new access drive.
 - 2. In addition to providing a safe transportation route for pedestrians and bicyclists, the new crossing will provide access from the redeveloped milliard to the residents of the neighborhoods on the north side of the river.
 - 3. The project is funded through the NHDOT Transportation Enhancement Program with budget of \$1.08 Million.
 - 4. The project is currently in the Engineering Study phase with construction scheduled to occur in Summer 2006. The project must be complete by Fall 2006 in order to meet an agreement the city has with the developer of the adjacent mill buildings.
- C. Historic Context by Liz Hengen
 - 1. A description of the existing conditions through the use of photos was provided.
 - 2. Proposed bridge is located within the Monadnock Mills National Register Historic District (part of Claremont's 1979 Multiple Resource nomination) as well as the cities designated Historical Local District. The south end of the bridge would be directly behind Mill #3 and west of the Weave Shed; an existing sluiceway that includes a stone-arched opening, could be impacted by necessary fill and retaining wall. IAC addressed this resource in its report, and Edna Feighner concurred that appropriate mitigation would be recordation and fill. The north end of the bridge would be on a concrete pad. Parking on that side would be on the site of a demolished mill, of which only the north wall survives. The mill yard has two existing bridges: a bowstring truss bridge (1870), one of

only two of its type in the country, according to NHDHR, that is upstream of the proposed bridge, and a box truss bridge (late 19th c.) that is downstream. At least one earlier bridge was also an arched metal structure.

3. Preferred bridge materials, including metal and stone (form liner) retaining wall, are based on those in the historic district. Among the slides shown was one of a typical lighting fixture, which would be reflected in those chosen for the proposed bridge and adjacent landscaping/walkways.

D. Bridge Type Study

1. City viewed this project as an opportunity to create a unique gateway type bridge so an architect was included on the design team. Of the several schemes that were prepared by the architect, an arch based theme was the most liked by the city.
2. Material types and costs have been evaluated. The City prefers a steel bridge but the cost of a custom steel arch bridge with tube (circular or rectangular sections) will not work within the available budget. Cost is approximately .75 million for the arch alone and a total bridge cost of about 1.5 Million. The available funds will limit what the city can do architecturally.
3. A timber glu-lam arch bridge is about half the cost of the custom steel bridge but the city would prefer steel
4. Prefabricated steel bridges were considered and cost data continues to be obtained from manufacturers. An investigation of the customization options and associated price increases is being performed. City is considering a roof on the bridge to provide protection from the elements. The arch concept may need to be dropped in order to facilitate a roof. Without a roof, a bowstring arch prefab bridge is an option.
5. The Central Street Bridge connecting New Hampton and Bristol has been reviewed. Relocating this bridge would require rivet removal, temporary cribbing to safely disassemble and remove the existing bridge, cleaning of lead paint and installation of new paint, shipping, and re-assembly with temporary cribbing at the new location.
6. A local bridge contractor was contacted to discuss costs associated with relocation of the Central Street Bridge. Contractor's opinion is that relocation costs would be well into the millions and would more than double the cost to rehabilitate the structure in place. Estimate information available reveals that in place rehab costs total over 1.5 million. A credit (approximately \$200,000) for bridge removal costs from the Central Street Replacement project is not sufficient enough to make the costs viable. Relocation of the Central Street Bridge is cost prohibitive and is therefore not a viable bridge option for the Claremont project.
7. The City has yet to select a final bridge type to move into final design.

E. Bridge alignment and span configuration

1. Single span is desirable for cost considerations. Single span geometry necessitates installing fill and walls in order to make the grades work. This fill will impact the sluiceway opening; however it isn't possible to avoid the impact given the site constraints. Private property and a sewer line exist to the north and the City has committed to providing the future restaurant with parking immediately to the east of the bridge.
2. There is also a wetlands consideration with the single span alternative because a portion of the fill extends below the delineated top of bank but above OHW. The limits are also

above the Q100 flood elevation. MacFarland Johnson attended a pre-application meeting with NHDES and received feedback that so long as the abutment is upslope of the 100 year flood plan and fairly minor impacts are proposed below top of bank (on the order of 300 square feet) then the necessary permits can be obtained.

F. Access Road Options and Parking Area

1. The existing access drive is not suitable as the primary access for vehicles entering the future parking lot and therefore this drive requires either substantial improvements or relocation. Three Access Drive Options have been evaluated.
 - a. The existing access drive on the easterly end of the mill parcel near the North Street/Lincoln Heights intersection.
 - b. The existing access drive, known as Maynard Street, on the westerly end of the mill parcel, which connects to Spring Street.
 - c. A potential access drive off North Street of the upper plateau area by the PSNH substation on the northwesterly portion of the mill parcel.
 - d. The concrete slab area will be the terminus for the proposed access drive and will be adapted into a parking lot.

Follow up – The city and MacFarland Johnson will finalize the bridge type selection process and bring the selected bridge type concept (plan and elevation view drawing) to the December 8 Cultural Resource Meeting. Regarding the impact to the sluiceway, E. Feighner indicated that the structure should be photo-documented and described, and a background history provided in a report to the NHDHR. Clean fill should be placed in the structure, creating a buried archaeological feature. L. Wilson requested that R. Rooney contact Eric Deloney, formerly of the National Park Service, to verify costs of deconstruction and reconstruction of the truss at Bristol-New Hampton. R. Rooney stated that MacFarland Johnson would issue a report with costs for all bridge options.

Portsmouth, STP-X-5379(025), 13455 and BHF-X-0015(006), 12900. Participants: Marc Laurin and Alex Vogt.

A. Vogt gave an update and brief description of the proposed project. The bridges spanning the US 1 Bypass are structurally deficient and need to be replaced. Over the past two years meetings have been held with the Technical Advisory Committee. Concepts for improving the Bypass have been evaluated to determine if they would meet the City's wish to encourage more traffic use of the bypass. The Bypass is proposed to remain a parkway type of facility with two lanes in each direction and will retain several signalized intersections. At the project's southern end, the Lafayette Road (US 1) intersection with the Bypass will be reconfigured. The existing southbound US 1 overpass of the Bypass will be eliminated and replaced with a signalized at-grade intersection. The Ledgewood Drive intersection with Lafayette Road will be relocated to intersect further to the north of the new intersection. Continuing north on Lafayette Road, improvements of its intersection with Greenleaf Ave will most likely be required. There are a couple of potentially historic properties in this area that may be slightly affected.

Along the Bypass, the existing intersection with Greenleaf Ave. will be modified to only allow right-turns in and right-turns out to the Bypass from westbound Greenleaf Ave. The Middle Road, Islington Street and the railroad tracks overpasses will be replaced on existing alignments. Further north a connection from Borthwick Ave. to Coakley Street would be build. The Coakley

Road/Cottage Street intersection with the Bypass would be signalized, while the Borthwick Ave. intersection with the Bypass would not be. An option that would connect Borthwick Ave with Cate Street to the east would place the signal at Borthwick and eliminate the signal at the Coakley Road/Cottage Street intersection. There will be impacts to buildings on Cottage Street.

There are two concepts for the replacement of the Portsmouth Traffic Circle. The at-grade option would require double left lanes with two through lanes for three of the approaches. The I-95 off-ramp would have three through lanes at the intersection, which would taper to two going east onto the Bypass. The single-point diamond interchange overpass option would allow for free flow of traffic to and from the Spaulding Turnpike.

There are access concerns to Woodbury Ave and the Liquor Store and these options need to be further evaluated. One proposal is for a new signalized ‘T’- intersection, located to the east of the Circle location, with a single point of access to Woodbury Ave. that would access both Woodbury Ave and the Liquor Store to the north.

Two concepts were examined for the Maplewood Ave. overpass area. The elimination of the overpass and its replacement with an at-grade signalized intersection is problematic because of the steepness of the Maplewood Ave. approaches, the impacts to adjacent historic properties/district, and access issues at the adjacent gas stations/truck stops. The replacement and widening of the overpass on location would impact a driveway access to Maplewood Ave. and would provide a new signalized ‘T’- intersection of the Bypass with Cutts Street to permit access to the north to Maplewood Ave. to and from the Bypass.

Further east a new access road to Market Street is also being evaluated. This would be at a signalized ‘T’- intersection that would connect to the north through the Albacore Park property. The project would not impact the display area for the park. This could remove traffic from Maplewood Ave. Concerns with the closeness of this intersection to the Sarah Long Bridge approach, potential queuing onto the lift-bridge, and traffic implications for the downtown area will be further evaluated. The public hearing is anticipated at the end of next year. L. Wilson commented that the concepts seem to have minimized impacts to historical properties. A Vogt replied that mostly minor slope impacts are anticipated, though a couple houses on Cottage Street may have greater impacts.

Nashua, CM-X-5315(043), 13130. Participants: Jon MacDonald, Rizzo (jmacdonald@rizzo.com), Ram Maddali (3344), and Wayne Husband, City of Nashua.

J. MacDonald explained the limits of work for the Daniel Webster Highway/Spit Brook Road Roadway and Traffic Signal Improvements Project as follows:

The project limits include Daniel Webster Highway (from approximately 300 feet south of the state line north to the intersection with Spit Brook Road) and Spit Brook Road (from the intersection with Whitegate Drive east to the intersection with Daniel Webster Highway). The project consists of the construction of a curbed median, cold plane and overlay on Daniel Webster Highway, road widening, sidewalk, curbing, and overlay on Spit Brook Road and the southern driveway to Webster Square Shopping Center.

The Cultural Resources committee commented that the area had seen significant development over the past twenty years, and as a result, architectural and archaeological resources do not occur within the project area. A “No Historic Properties Affected Memo” can be signed.

Concord, X-A000(090), 13889. Participants: Matthew Walsh, Community Development Project Manager and Charles Hood (225-8595; mwalsh@onconcord.com).

Matt Walsh of the City of Concord discussed the construction of two new bus shelters in Downtown Concord. He explained that the City had been awarded a \$75,000 CMAQ grant to support the construction effort.

M. Walsh explained that the City had been somewhat slow in getting the project started. He reported that the city has drafted the RFP to engage required architectural and environmental services for the project. However, the city has not issued the RFP in case changes were required as a result of the Cultural Resources meeting.

Mr. Walsh presented two handouts, which contained photographs of bus structure similar to what the city may propose as part of the project. He indicated that the bus shelters would be located on North Main Street on city-owned sidewalk adjacent to the State House and Eagle Hotel.

The committee reviewed the photographs and agreed consensus that the shelters should be as transparent as possible so as to protect the view of (and from) surrounding buildings. M. Walsh indicated this would not be an issue with the City. The committee felt that a predominantly glass structure would best complement the surrounding architecture, as the east and west sides of the street are dominated by different materials (red brick on east side of street, granite on west side).

The committee discussed roof design for the structures. M. Walsh indicated that the city would use its best efforts to mimic roof forms and materials of adjacent structures. Discussion of potential “gothic” copper roof style (similar to Clock Tower) ensued. He also reported that the shelters would likely be designed to incorporate newspaper boxes, which have been appearing in Downtown lately. The committee felt this would be appropriate.

M. Walsh indicated that the city’s preliminary schedule for the project was as follows:

➤ Engage A&E Team	January 2006
➤ Begin Schematic Design	January 2006
➤ Select Final Design	March 2006
➤ Completion of Final Design and Permitting	April 2006
➤ Completion of Construction Documents	May 2006
➤ Receive Bids	June 2006
➤ Award Contract	June 2006
➤ Start of Construction	August 2006
➤ Construction Completion	December 2006

M. Walsh noted that the city’s RFP was designed to permit flexibility, allowing the use of a prefabricated bus shelter unit in the event one could be found. If not, the city would proceed with design of custom shelters.

M. Walsh asked if any formal memorandum of agreement (MOA) would be required with NHDHR regarding the project since the bus shelters would be located within National Register Districts. NHDHR staff responded that no formal MOA or inventory work would be required. However, L. Wilson stated that ADA concerns would probably need to be addressed. The city should return to the Cultural Resources Meeting to review the project before selecting a final design. Charlie Hood confirmed that the project could be treated as not having major impact on historic resources for purpose of environmental review, a no adverse effect.

Hudson, 3A (no numbers available). Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD (668-8223x187).

The Town of Hudson proposes to increase traffic efficiency and safety along the NH Route 3A corridor, known locally as Central Street in this area. The project has evaluated three existing concurrent intersections on Central Street at Chase Street, Library Street and Lowell Street. The Chase Street intersection would be reconstructed to better align the two roads and slightly reduce pavement width. Planned improvements also include a new signal installation at the Central Street / Library Street intersection, with signal timings coordinated with the adjacent existing signalized Central Street/Lowell Road intersection. In addition, Central Street would be re-striped to better utilize its existing width, including the addition of auxiliary turn lanes, traffic island modification, and replacement of poor pedestrian amenities, including non-ADA compliant sidewalks. All roadway travel lanes would be 11-foot wide. With exception of several construction easements, it is expected that work would be within existing right-of-way.

Determination

NHDHR determined that no historic or archaeological properties would be affected by this project including the mast arms. No further review of cultural resources is required. A memo will be signed.

Rochester, Hanson/Central Avenue (no numbers provided): Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD.

This project is city funded with EPA, NPDES Phase II NOI required. The City of Rochester proposes to reconstruct Hanson Street and Central Avenue in downtown Rochester. Hanson Street is an east west running, local street that connects two highly traveled roads, Wakefield Street and Columbus Avenue or NH Route 125. Roadway cobbles that were originally used to construct Hanson Street still exist underneath the existing roadway. Central Street is a small road that intersects the middle of Hanson Street, connecting with Portland Street to the south. Roadway improvements for Hanson Street would include replacing sewer, water, and storm drain systems with upgraded mains. Improvements would be consistent with the character of the surrounding area and the *Plan for Downtown Rochester - Final Report*, dated June 10, 2003. The roadway typical section will consider streetscape and ornamental lighting features consistent with recent downtown projects in the area and certain overhead utilities would be relocated to an underground position. The original cobbles would be used on site as landscaping features. Central Street will also be reconstructed. However, utilities would be located above ground. Work would be done within existing right-of-way.

In addition to the on-street improvements, two adjacent parking lots located immediately north of Hanson Street would be redesigned and reconstructed. This work would provide better vehicle

flow and allow for a continuous pedestrian promenade or walkway from Hanson Street and adjacent areas to City Hall. Typical improvements would include ornamental trees and lighting, sidewalks, and new pavement.

Determination

NHDHR felt that excavations for tree plantings and lighting posts in the existing parking lot areas might have the potential to disturb any underground historic archaeological resources if they exist. NHDHR determined that a simple Phase IA archaeological review must be completed to determine whether any former building foundations or other resources might still be located within the parking lots. No further architectural review was requested.

Winchester 14360 (no federal #). Participants: Jon Evans and Joyce McKay.

J. McKay presented a plan and photographs of the project area, indicating the locations of mast arms and their distances as currently proposed. L. Wilson noted that the project area was eligible for the National Register and that the project introduced rather massive structures into what has been a rural village. She requested a different design that would diminish the intrusion of the mast arms into the potential district. She also requested that the NHDOT consult with the heritage commission in Winchester about their design.

Lancaster (no project numbers). Participant: Joyce McKay

J. McKay stated that Victoria Chase was considering the design of a hammerhead parking area in front of the building now owned by the state so that it could be sold in place. Its construction would likely require an easement from the adjacent landowner, Sutherland, the previous owner of this property. If this parking area cannot be constructed, then the Department would need to remove the building, following a HABS documentation and perhaps some additional mitigation.

Monroe Barnet, A000(336), 14095. Participant: Cathy Goodmen

C. Goodmen noted that the historic lighting fixtures at each end of the bridge trusses had been discussed at a previous meeting. The NHDOT had originally indicated that they would be fixed or replaced with reproduction fixtures. The design staff has learned that these fixtures are often used for target practice and probably new ones would be also. There is lighting at this location from a utility pole, so there is no need to replace these fixtures. It was agreed that the original ones would be left in their current location and not replaced or repaired. C. Goodmen gave J. Garvin a copy of the 2004 bridge inspection report as part of the commitments for work on this bridge. She also stated that the rail system was determined. The rails will be mounted without the W-beams.

Kensington, X-A000(109), 13908: Participants: Joyce McKay and Charles Hood

The Town of Kensington wished to improve the entrances to and enlarge a parking lot in the town center. At the two entrances, excavation would go down as much as 18 inches. The parking lot is on property originally established with the construction of a dwelling in the early 18th century. It is not known where this dwelling was located within the property boundaries. J. McKay and E.

Feighner agreed to monitor excavation of the area to be disturbed prior to the beginning of construction. The town will conduct the excavation on December 7th. If archaeological deposits are found, the town would need to redesign its project or hire a qualified archaeologist to mitigate the impact.

****Memos:**

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager

c.c.	J. Brillhart	K. Cota	N. Mayville	Bill Cass
	C. Barleon, OSP	C. Waszczuk	D. Lyford	
	V. Chase	R. Roach, ACOE	H. Kinter, FHWA	

S:\MEETINGS\SHPO\05minutes\11-10-17.doc